



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 08/907,182   | 08/06/1997  | SHUNPEI YAMAZAKI     | 07977/023002        | 7978             |
| 26171  | 7590        | 03/25/2004           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.<br>1425 K STREET, N.W.<br>11TH FLOOR<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500 |             |                      | DIAMOND, ALAN D     |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 1753                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

08/907,182

Applicant(s)

YAMAZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Alan Diamond

Art Unit

1753

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.Claim(s) objected to: None.Claim(s) rejected: 26-30, 32-55, 57-71, 73-76, 78, 79, 81-91, 93-99 and 103-107.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



Alan Diamond  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1753

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that in Figure 1D of U.S Patent 6,544,826, the portions of the phosphorous layer (107) that are separated from the semiconductor layer (102) by the mask (104) would be prevented from causing gettering of the underlying semiconductor film, and accordingly, cannot be said to be part of a gettering layer. However, this argument is not deemed to be persuasive because said layer (107) is a gettering layer, and said layer covers the entire surface of the semiconductor (102). The situation in said Figure 1D where gettering occurs only at the opening (103) renders obvious the instant gettering of the catalyst metal.

Please also note that while Figure 1D is an example of said patent's process, said patent is not limited to the example. In claim 1 of said patent, the solution of phosphorous is applied to the crystallized semiconductor film. This inherently encompasses the situation where the solution is applied either to the entire surface of the semiconductor film or to a portion of the film. Accordingly, in the absence of anything unexpected, it would have been well within the skill of an artisan to have applied the phosphorous solution to the entire surface of the semiconductor film because such is within the scope of claim 1 of said patent.